DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 304 433 SP 030 964

AUTHOR Oja, Sharon Nodie; Ham, Maryellen C.
TITLE A Collaborative Approach to Leadership in Supervision: Practice Profile. Part C of the Final Report.
INSTITUTION New Hampshire Univ., Durham. Dept. of Education.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE 1 Oct 88
CONTRACT 400-85-1056
NOTE 42p.; University of New Hampshire Collaborative Action Research Projects. For related documents, see SP 030 962-963.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Action Research; *College School Cooperation; *Cooperating Teachers; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; Preservice Teacher Education; Principals; *Program Content; *Program Development; Program Evaluation; Student Characteristics; Teacher Characteristics; *Teacher Interns

ABSTRACT

In this section of the final report a complete practice file for developing a similar program is presented, describing 17 components of the program: (1) collaborative action research process; (2) principal leadership group; (3) teacher supervision group; (4) school-university task force on supervision; (5) coordinator of teachers and interns (CTI); (6) evidence of successful collaboration; (7) institutionalizing tasks and roles for the collaborative supervision model in schools; (8) institutionalizing tasks and roles for the collaborative supervision model in the university teacher education Program; (9) advisement and placement processes for student teaching interns; (10) selection of university supervisors; (11) selection of cooperating teachers; (12) knowledge base in adult development and models of supervision; (13) collaborative supervision matching model process (teacher/intern); (14) observation, feedback, and evaluation process; (15) the exploring teaching and graduate intern seminar courses; (16) supervision/evaluation measures; and (17) the supervisory competencies assessment inventory. For each component a list is provided of ideal practice, acceptable practice, and unacceptable practice. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 1.310/2:304433

H66-A-3

ED304433

A COLLABCRATIVE APPROACH TO LEADERSHIP IN SUPERVISION

PRACTICE PROFILE

(Part C of The Final Report)

1 October 1988

OERI No. 400-85-1056
October, 1985 to September, 1988

SP030964

U S DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

UNIVERSITY OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

Collaborative Action Research Projects
Department of Education
College of Liberal Arts
Morrill Hall
Durham, New Hampshire 03824-3595
(603) 862-2379

A COLLABORATIVE APPROACH TO LEADERSHIP IN SUPERVISION

PRACTICE PROFILE

(Part C of The Final Report)

1 October 1988

Sharon Nodie Oja, Ph.D., Principal Investigator
Associate Professor of Education
University of New Hampshire
Durham, New Hampshire 03824-3595

Maryellen C. Ham, Ed.D., Project Director
Assistant Superintendent of Schools
Colchester, Vermont 05446

Final Report: A COLLABORATIVE APPROACH TO LEADERSHIP IN SUPERVISION

Part A: Project Portrayal
Part B: Program Assessment Report
Part C: Practice Profile

Project funded by:

U.S. Department of Education ED. No. 400-85-1056
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
October, 1985 to September, 1988

The work upon which this final report is based was performed pursuant to Contract No. 400-85-1056 of the Office of Educational Research and Improvement. It does not, however, necessarily reflect the views of that agency.

PROJECT: A COLLABORATIVE APPROACH TO LEADERSHIP IN SUPERVISION

I. PROJECT DEMOGRAPHICS

University Student Characteristics

- Undergraduate Exploring Teachers in prerequisite education course (optional); Year 2: n=33; Year 3: n=35.
- Graduate Teaching Interns in full year internship; cluster placement of six interns per site; Year 2: n=10; Year 3: n=14.

Teacher Characteristics

- During the Year 1 training, there were 29 elementary teachers, 4 middle school teachers, 1 elementary school counselor, 5 elementary school principals and 2 middle school principals.
- The Project was implemented in the elementary schools, so in Year 2, there were 18 elementary school teachers involved and in Year 3, 16 elementary school teachers. Most of these teachers were cooperating teachers for interns.

University Faculty Characteristics

- University supervisors of the full year internship; one supervisor for every six interns in a cluster placement site. During Year 2 and Year 3 there were two cluster sites with active Teacher Supervision Groups.

School/District Characteristics

- Total of five elementary schools in two school districts in the seacoast area of New Hampshire within 30 minute drive from the university formed three Teacher Supervision Groups for the Year 1 training and were consolidated into two Teacher Supervision Groups for Year 2 and Year 3; one Teacher Supervision Group for each district. NOTE: The junior high principals and a few teachers in each district joined for the training year, but collaborative supervision in cluster sites at the secondary level will not be begun until 1989.

Program Characteristics

- Length is ongoing.
- Focus is on teaching internship, cooperating teachers as supervisors; and principal leadership.
- Target group includes preservice teachers, inservice teachers, and principals.
- Primary research bases are adult development, professional development, and supervision.
- Special feature is the process of Collaborative Action Research.

II. IMPLEMENTATION REQUIREMENTS

Costs:

Start up funds of $1,000 per cluster site for either a Coordinator of Teachers and Interns (CTI) or for a University Supervisor to develop the site into a cluster placement for interns. Increased university stipends ($300) for cooperating teachers who are involved in collaborative supervision. Annual funding for the CTI positions. Regular university supervision costs - their role changes, not their salary. Additional annual funding to conferences and workshops plus arrangements for substitutes.

Training:

In the start-up year, from Oct-Dec a Principal Leadership Group meets six times for training, followed by prospective cooperating teachers in each school cluster site meeting biweekly for training from Feb-June. In subsequent years each school site includes some follow-up training for new and old cooperating teachers within the supervision group meetings. The university provides at least one sharing workshop per year for cooperating teachers from different schools/districts.

Materials/Equipment:

Research articles on adult development, alternative models of supervision and collaborative action research (one set for each participant). Resources for additional Xeroxing and typing. University library cards.

Personnel:

At least one university and one school staff representative who are more familiar with adult development theories, alternative models of supervision, and the process of collaborative action research. They have skill in working with teachers and interest in doing collaborative research with teachers on issues of supervision. They coordinate the start up training and meet regularly with teacher/principal groups.

Organizational Arrangements:

Most meetings on-site in the school or in teachers' homes. Administrative support in allowing interns to take over their cooperating teachers' classes so the cooperating teachers can meet together as a group when necessary during school time. University meeting space available for joint meetings of collaborative supervision participants from different schools/districts.

III. PRACTICE PROFILE: A COLLABORATIVE APPROACH TO SUPERVISION

Part 1: Component Checklist

I: ORGANIZING PARTNERSHIPS AND MAINTAINING COMMUNICATION WITHIN AND AMONG THE SCHOOLS AND BETWEEN THE UNIVERSITY AND SCHOOLS

---

1. Component: Collaborative Action Research Process

IDEAL	ACCEPTABLE	UNACCEPTABLE
- In order to nurture creative approaches to collaborative supervision, collaborative action research (CAR) groups are formed. They consist of public school teachers, principals, and university faculty who regularly meet to identify common goals and to use action research strategies to collaboratively generate and investigate topics in supervision. - In the CAR groups, teachers, principals, and university faculty join together with the goals of improving practice, contributing to educational theory, and providing staff development. They meet on site in schools; reach consensus on goals which address each person's immediate concerns; use cycles of action research to investigate and apply research findings or do original research; co-author and co-present reports of their work; and develop a collegial, trusting relationship as well as a communication network between schools and university.	- Public school staff and university staff periodically meet to share common concerns and future directions. Action is often taken to address such concerns and/or choose directions to pursue. A spirit of mutual support and collaboration is nurtured. - Teachers and principals assume responsibility for supervising university students/interns. Research is discussed, and public school staff members are consulted about the university's knowledge base in teacher education.	- Joint school and university faculty partnerships are established, although representatives seldom meet. Goal achievement is not monitored. Most collaborative ventures exist on paper rather than in practice.

2. Component: Principal Leadership Group

IDEAL

- A Principal Leadership Group (PLG), composed of all interested (district) principals focuses on implementing a variety of supervision strategies in their schools and on using collaborative strategies within their district.
- The PLG meets weekly at the start of the program to learn the content areas of adult development theory and alternative models of supervision; then meets three times a year.
- The PLG uses a collaborative action research process.
- The PLG helps form Teacher Supervision Groups by announcing a Collaborative Approach to Supervision, and inviting teachers to participate.
- Support is provided for the PLG by the District Superintendent who also informs the School Board.

ACCEPTABLE

- Time blocks during regular administrative meetings in the district are periodically allocated to share collaborative strategies, especially those related to differentiating supervision.
- Consultants are hired to work with individual principals and/or all administrators in exploring and applying different approaches to staff supervision.

UNACCEPTABLE

- Although the benefits of collaboration may be stated, little if any time is allocated for principals to collaborate. Supervisory practices vary a great deal from building to building, and alternative models are not discussed.

3. Component: Teacher Supervision Group

IDEAL	ACCEPTABLE	UNACCEPTABLE
- Within each school a Teacher Supervision Group (TSG) involving all interested teachers is organized. This group includes the principal and the university supervisor. - Each TSG meets biweekly to explore the content areas of alternative models of supervision and adult development stages and then monthly to discuss application of the content to supervision with graduate interns, undergraduate exploring teachers, peers, and supervisors. - Each TSG uses the process of Collaborative Action Research. - Each TSG establishes a collaborative environment for implementing a variety of supervisory models within their school. - Each TSG identifies one person to schedule and facilitate meetings. Time is allocated for these meetings. - Both Central Office and building level administrative support exists to nurture TSG initiatives.	- Nearby schools together form one Teacher Supervision Group with the support of each school's principal. - The TSG concept is recognized as a professional development initiative within the district and by the university. - University faculty or consultants periodically meet with the TSG in their district(s).	- Supervision is viewed as an administrative function. - Teacher supervision groups are neither encouraged nor validated. - TSGs are left on their own to explore alternative approaches to supervision after only a brief exposure to the many new concepts involved, without continued collaboration with experts in the focus area of collaborative supervision. - The roles and responsibilities of public school teachers and university faculty are viewed as separate and distinct.

4. Component: School-University Task Force on Supervision

IDEAL	ACCEPTABLE	UNACCEPTABLE
- School and University personnel (teachers, principals, university supervisors, teacher education program faculty and coordinators) meet five times a year on a School-University Task Force to discuss Collaborative Approaches to Supervision in terms of organizational structures, roles, instructional content and processes, evaluation, and intern placement. - Topics include identification of supervisory competencies and the development of school based models for cooperating teacher supervision. - Participants use consensus in decision making, each representative sharing his/her area of expertise, and each having equal time to share. - Key issues/critical topics in School-University Task Force Meetings include flexibility in the development of alternative collaborative approaches to supervision, differing philosophical positions on certain aspects of the cooperating teacher's role, and the importance of understanding individual school context issues.	- A public school/university task force periodically meets to share common concerns and future directions. - A spirit of collaboration to enhance intern supervision is the focus of these meetings. - Public school staff input is actively solicited before major changes in the university's teacher education program are proposed.	- A public school/university task force is formed. Membership and meetings are erratic with no clear focus or specific goals. - Input and/or feedback on the university teacher education program is either not elicited or ignored.

5. Component: Coordinator of Teachers and Interns (CTI)

IDEAL	ACCEPTABLE	UNACCEPTABLE
- A school Coordinator of Teachers and Interns (CTI) is selected from interested and experienced cooperating teachers in a school.	- In schools where no cooperating teacher assumes the CTI role, the university supervisor assumes this role. Cooperating teachers work with the supervisor designated for their school district.	- No one at the school or university takes responsibility for coordinating interns and cooperating teachers in a cluster placement site.
- The CTI organizes cooperating teachers in a school cluster site to meet together biweekly to discuss issues in the intern supervision process. Principal may meet with this group; university supervisor meets monthly with this group.	- The university supervisor meets twice each semester with all CTs as a group. The school principal may also attend these meetings.	- Groups meet but with no direction or forward movement.
- The CTI organizes interns and cooperating teachers in the school to meet jointly as a group every month.	- Interns and cooperating teachers in a school meet together four times a year, during their scheduled seminars.	- Cooperating teachers in a cluster placement do not meet together as a group. Neither the principal or the university supervisor meets with all CTs as a group.
- The CTI is paid $1000 per year by the university.		
- The CTI organizes interns and cooperating teachers in the school to meet jointly as a group every month.	- Interns and cooperating teachers in a school meet together four times a year during their scheduled seminars.	- Although placed in a cluster setting, interns basically work with their own CT, and weekly with other interns in seminar.

6. Component: Evidence of Successful Collaboration

IDEAL	ACCEPTABLE	UNACCEPTABLE
- Participants know each other and trust each other to an extent that they think out loud in the group, voice undeveloped thoughts, and relate the discussion topic to personal experiences.	- Participants are able to reflect upon the quality of interaction in the group and to move toward conditions which would encourage increased trust.	- Participants look to authority and search for exact truths; there is concern for rules and fully developed propositions.
- Group members critique authorities and each other, and use open-ended questions to try to understand each other.	- Participants are accepting and non-critical of others' ideas. Each group member participates to the degree he/she feels most comfortable.	- The group lacks connection and support for others' ideas; this often results in an adversarial form of conversation involving defending one's own idea and attacking others' ideas.
- All group members participate fully; joking and laughing is commonplace.	- Members support one another and their organizations, but few individual or group challenges are voiced.	- Members exhibit impatience with thinking aloud, voicing undeveloped thoughts, and sharing personal experiences.
- Group members are supportive and can talk about themselves in a critical manner.		- Making teachers more effective supervisors of interns is a goal, but enhancing the teacher role as a professional is not valued or viewed as a responsibility. valued or viewed as a responsibility.
- School and university personnel involved in A Collaborative Approach to Supervision take pride and feel responsible for creating new leadership roles for teachers.	- School/university personnel support teacher professionalism, but do not clearly define or structure incentives to nurture this professionalism.	
- A spirit of professionalism and the incentives to nurture this spirit become a focus.		

7. **Component: Institutionalizing Tasks and Roles for the Collaborative Supervision Model in Schools**

IDEAL	ACCEPTABLE	UNACCEPTABLE
- Teachers and principals work together within their schools and with the superintendent and school boards to design ways to carry out Collaborative Supervision without federal funding. - Financial support may include school funding of teacher release time, salaries of substitutes, conference attendance, and clerical resources. Moral support may include direct involvement, publicity, recognition, and positive encouragement.	- Administrators support and facilitate institutionalizing of alternative approaches to differentiating supervision, although financial support is not provided.	- Neither financial support nor active nurturing of teacher/administrator collaboration on supervision is evident.

8. **Component: Institutionalizing Tasks and Roles for the Collaborative Supervision Model in the University Teacher Education Program**

IDEAL	ACCEPTABLE	UNACCEPTABLE
- University supervisors with experience in Collaborative Supervision regularly discuss their roles in the University Supervisor's biweekly meetings.	- University supervisors in collaborative supervision sites occasionally report to other faculty supervisors about their experiences with collaborative supervision strategies.	- Communication among university faculty members responsible for supervision in teacher education is infrequent and lacks any specific focus.
- Faculty involved in collaborative supervision talk regularly with the university Director of Teacher Education, the Director of Field Experiences, and Teacher Education Committee to maintain collaborative supervision as an alternative to traditional supervisory practices.	- University faculty involved in collaborative supervision forward copies of written reports on successful collaborative supervision practices to the Director of Teacher Education, Coordinator of Field Experiences, and members of the Teacher Education Committee with requests for action.	- Infrequent communication between faculty involved in collaborative supervision and key university faculty members in teacher education results in few, if any, successful project practices or role changes being initiated at the university.
- The Teacher Education Committee documents these discussions, shares progress with all education faculty, and implements possible practices.		
- University budget includes a significant stipend ($1000) paid to a cooperating teacher who takes on the responsibility of Coordinator of Teachers and Interns (CTI) in his/her school site with cluster placement of 5-6 interns.	- The university budget continues to fund stipends for the CTI position and enhanced cooperating teacher roles.	- The university budget does not reflect any financial commitment to institutionalizing effective public school/university collaboration in supervision.
- All cooperating teachers with experience and specific training in supervision are paid increased stipends ($300 per year instead of the usual $100 per year stipend).		
- University faculty supervisors are provided course release time and/or supplemental funds ($750-1000), to work more closely with CTs and principals in the schools to develop a new school site and collaborative approaches to supervision.	- Additional university faculty time in schools is supported, but not funded.	

II. RECRUITMENT, SELECTION, AND PLACEMENT PROCESSES

9. Component: Advisement and Placement Processes for Student Teaching Interns

IDEAL	ACCEPTABLE	UNACCEPTABLE
- Student teaching interns are advised of the Cluster Placement and Collaborative Supervision options.	- Interns are aware of cluster placement sites, but are not given the advisement needed to choose which cluster, if any, might meet their needs.	- Student teaching interns are not advised of the Cluster Placement, or the Collaborative Supervision option does not exist.
- With the consensus of the Coordinator of Field Placement, university supervisor, school principal, and cooperating teachers, interns can select placements after being assigned to a participating school district.	- The university supervisor and school staff are involved in intern placement, but interns are not assigned to specific schools prior to the CT/Intern match.	- The university supervisor and school personnel are not involved in the advisement process, only in the final placement decisions.
- The Coordinator of Teachers and Interns in each site 1) organizes a meeting of the principal, teachers, and prospective interns on site in the school, and 2) facilitates interns' observations and interviews with the cooperating teachers.	- The university supervisor organizes a meeting of cooperating teachers and prospective interns in March, prior to the internship year.	- Structure and communication in the advisement process is loose and inconsistent.
- The CTI, CTs, and principal meet together to make suggestions as to appropriate CT/Intern matches.	- The supervisor and CTs meet together to suggest appropriate CT/Intern matches.	

10. **Component: Selection of University Supervisors**

IDEAL	ACCEPTABLE	UNACCEPTABLE
- University supervisors interested in being involved in a Cluster Placement and Collaborative Supervision Model are given both the opportunity to be assigned to one school Cluster and the training and support to implement a Collaborative Supervision Model.	- Interested supervisors are assigned to school cluster placements. They understand the goals and process of a Collaborative Supervision Model.	- Without regard to interest, supervisors are assigned to one school cluster.
- In addition to carrying out the traditional triad model of supervision, supervisors agree to meet monthly with the group of cooperating teachers and principal in the Cluster Placement site.	- The supervisor meets periodically with cooperating teachers on site. Administrators may or may not be involved.	- The supervisor does not meet with the group of cooperating teachers and principal.
- The university Field Placement Director and the Director of Teacher Education evaluate the success of each cluster by eliciting feedback from all involved: interns, CTs, principal, and supervisor. Future assignments are based upon this data.	- School staff members evaluate themselves, the supervisor, and their school site in terms of its effeciveness as a cluster placement.	

11. Component: Selection of Cooperating Teachers

IDEAL

- Several teachers in a school have the opportunity to become a School Cluster Placement site for interns. Together with the school principal they contact the Director of Field Experiences.

- Teachers and principal are willing to: undertake training in the Collaborative Supervision Model, regularly meet together as a group during the school year to discuss supervision issues, meet monthly as a group with the university supervisor, and be involved in the placement process of interns.

- Cooperating teachers make a definite commitment to learn appropriate supervision strategies. They are also rated as excellent teachers and role models/mentors by their administrators.

ACCEPTABLE

- Director of Field Placement, in conjunction with school principals, determine appropriate sites and select cooperating teachers.

- Cooperating teachers within a school or district cluster occasionally meet with the university supervisor to discuss pertinent issues in supervision.

UNACCEPTABLE

- Several teachers and principal desire to be a School Cluster Placement site for interns, but do not commit to meeting regularly, feel it unnecessary to meet as a group monthly with the university supervisor, or are unwilling to be trained in the instructional content and processes of Collaborative Supervision.

- Some teachers who are not viewed as excellent role models for future educators become cooperating teachers.

III. INSTRUCTIONAL CONTENT

12. Component: Knowledge Base in Adult Development and Models of Supervision

IDEAL

- School and University Personnel in the school based collaborative supervision groups investigate use of two areas of research knowledge: adult cognitive development stages and alternative models of supervision in order to provide a theoretical framework for the group to structure its common goals and operating procedures.
- The supervision group brainstorms the scope of the two content areas and forms initial boundaries for the topics/concerns/issues to be researched.
- The group divides into subgroups to equalize the labor in identifying the specific literature sources and seeking them out.
- Those who are able help in "quality control" of the sources and types of sources for investigation in order to maintain high quality and in-depth investigation of content areas.
- Subgroups assimilate, summarize, and present to the whole group (orally and in two page written outlines) the research basis, key concepts, and applications of the research topics in adult development and models of supervision.
- Individuals become the leaders/resources for each research topic investigated in the collaborative action research group.

ACCEPTABLE

- School/university personnel focus on one topic at a time and investigate it together. The group determines these focus areas and the amount of time it will spend on each topic.
- University supervisor or faculty member "teaches" the knowledge base instead of presenting it for group exploration.
- Resources and research summaries on adult development and supervision are made available to all participants.

UNACCEPTABLE

- Sources chosen for investigation are popular magazines such as Time, Life, etc. and not educational journals.
- Written and oral summaries of research do not highlight key concepts and findings.
- Research areas are interpreted in a limited fashion.

IV. INSTRUCTIONAL PROCESSES

13. Component: Collaborative Supervision Matching Model Process (Teacher/Intern)

IDEAL

- The cooperating teacher and supervisor use formal written assessment of the intern developmental stage based upon Paragraph Completion Test (Hunt), Defining Issues Test (Rest), Sentence Completion Test (Loevinger).
- The cooperating teacher and supervisor informally assess the developmental stage of the intern using observation data from conferences and interactions of the intern.
- School and university personnel use their knowledge of adult development to select appropriate supervision strategies which both support the supervisee in new learning experiences and challenge the supervisee's learning to new levels.
- In situations which are impromptu, and in other situations which are structured conferences, interventions come from a framework of strong theoretical references.
- Public school and university administrators select cooperating teachers capable of applying the Matching Model Process.

33

ACCEPTABLE

- Cooperating teachers and university supervisors are aware of the knowledge base in adult development, but do not make formal attempts to apply this knowledge.
- Traditional attempts to appropriately match CTs and interns are used (needs, strengths, learning/teaching styles, personality, etc.).
- Supervisors and CTs are familiar with more than one supervisory model, and attempt to use alternative approaches with their supervisees.

UNACCEPTABLE

- Cooperating teachers and supervisors neither use nor value the knowledge base in adult development.
- CTs and supervisors make few, if any, attempts to vary their supervisory strategies.
- Administrators (school and university) do not consider the matching process when selecting new CTs.

34

14. **Component: Observation, Feedback, and Evaluation Process**

IDEAL	ACCEPTABLE	UNACCEPTABLE
- University supervisors meet bi-weekly with the intern and cooperating teacher in a three-way conference (triad supervision model).	- Intern, cooperating teachers and university supervisor meet on a schedule determined by them, pursuing topics of commonly agreed need.	- University supervisor meets only with teacher or intern. She/he assumes all supervisory responsibility for the intern.
- Added characteristics of the new collaboration model include: equal participation in the three-way conference, joint leadership and responsibility, and consensus in decision making.	- Cooperating teachers and supervisors occasionally use interaction logs or other forms of record keeping to document intern supervision.	- Intern, cooperating teacher and university supervisor meet on an irregular and infrequent basis with little or no basis for discussion and/or continuity from one conference to the next.
- Cooperating teachers and university supervisors use the supervisory interaction logs on a regular basis to document interactions with an intern, and focus discussions in the TSG meetings.	- The cooperating teacher observes his/her intern regularly and conferences about observations weekly.	- No record keeping mechanism is used to document supervisory interactions with intern.
- Cooperating teachers observe segments of the intern's teaching daily, document interactions, and provide frequent feedback to the intern. CTs attend at least part of the intern seminars bi-weekly.	- University supervisors regularly meet with both CTs and interns to share perceptions and collate observation data. Supervisors invite CTs to participate in the intern seminars.	- The cooperating teacher relies upon the university supervisor to provide most feedback to the intern.
- Both the CTs and interns keep reflective journals which enable them to discover patterns in their own behavior. These patterns may be discussed with others.	- The intern, CT, and supervisor meet as a triad at the beginning and ending of each semester to review and discuss the formal intern evaluation assessment.	- Except in completing the formal intern evaluation, CTs and supervisors do not discuss their observation/feedback regarding the intern's progress.
- Consistent, frequent, and varied observation strategies are used by the CT and the university supervisor.		

35

36

15. **Component: The Exploring Teaching and Graduate Intern Seminar Courses**

IDEAL

- The role of cooperating teachers is extended through their involvement as course collaborators in the Exploring Teaching course and the Intern Seminar.
- Cooperating teachers' matching of supervision strategies to developmental needs is enhanced because they are more able to recognize developmental differences.
- Intern Seminar agendas are frequently planned collaboratively by university supervisors, cooperating teachers, and interns.

ACCEPTABLE

- Cooperating teachers occasionally participate in the Exploring Teaching and Intern Seminar courses.
- University supervisors keep CTs well informed about the topics and issues of concern discussed by interns in their weekly seminar.

UNACCEPTABLE

- Public school staff members are generally unaware and uninvolved in undergraduate Exploring Teaching courses.
- Graduate intern seminars are held on the university campus during times which preclude the involvement of cooperating teachers.

V. SUPERVISION/EVALUATION MEASURES

16. Component: Supervision/Evaluation Measures

IDEAL

- Prior to using the intern evaluation form, the supervisor, CT, and intern discuss its format, content, and establish a common vocabulary for discussing strengths and needs.
- The cooperating teacher and university supervisor complete the Intern Evaluation Form and compare with the intern's self-evaluation twice a year in the triad meeting of all three.
- Mutually agreed upon areas of strength and improvement are documented.

ACCEPTABLE

- Interns, cooperating teachers, and university supervisors complete the evaluation form in isolation once each year.
- Documentation of mutually agreed upon areas of strength and improvement is not formally recorded.

UNACCEPTABLE

- Intern evaluation form is not used or is used informally as a guide.
- Form is completed by cooperating teacher and intern only, or by supervisor and teacher only, etc.
- No areas for improvement are agreed upon in the three-way meeting of intern, cooperating teacher and university supervisor.

17. **Component: The Supervisory Competencies Assessment Inventory**

IDEAL

- Cooperating teachers, principals and university supervisors use the Supervisory Competencies Assessment as a self-evaluation measure.
- Areas of growth in adult development, instructional leadership and collaboration are documented.
- The Inventory is used to document a series of specific interactions with interns, exploring teaching students, peers, or supervisees. Patterns of behavior are validated with data.
- Supervision group decisions for direction are based upon self-evaluation using the Supervisory Assessment Inventory.
- Based upon needs and interests, CTs, principals, and university supervisors explore a variety of ways to increase their knowledge of supervision and adult development.
- The Inventory instrument is assessed and revised by group consensus on an annual basis.

ACCEPTABLE

- Supervisors use the Inventory as an assessment tool in a group setting.
- Cooperating teachers, principals, and/or supervisees select one part of the Inventory as a focus for assessment within a given year.
- Supervisors and cooperating teachers mutually explore ways to broaden their knowledge of supervision and the theories of adult development.

UNACCEPTABLE

- No assessment of supervisory competencies, formal or informal, is valued or used.
- Improvements are not documented or directions determined.